

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

RECEIVED
2022 OCT -8 AM 3:46
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

W.P. d.b.a. **WITHOUT PREJUDICE,**
KINGDOM OF PRIESTS;
Plaintiffs.

-versus-

THE UNITED STATES,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
NEW YORK STATE ~~UNITED~~ COURT SYSTEM,
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
AND COMMUNITY SUPERVISION;
Defendants.

Case Number: _____

Plaintiff(s) demand(s) a trial by: ____ JURY ____ COURT (Select only one).

Plaintiff(s) in the above-captioned action, allege(s) as follows:

RECEIVED
SDNY INFO SE OFFICE
2022 OCT 14 PM 3:00

COMPLAINT

Humanity. At issue in the instant complaint is the meaning of humanity in America, who qualifies to be counted among its constituent members within that region of the world referred to as the jurisdiction of the United States, and in that census, extended the rights acknowledged in THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE to be endowed by Our Creator in our very creation **as human beings.**

In spite of the defendant THE UNITED STATES' admission in its founding documents (*...we hold these truths to be self-evident that **all men are created equal.***"), all men within its jurisdiction have NOT been treated equally throughout its history. In fact, it is the defendant's unbridled, irrational, systemic commitment to depriving a particular faction within humanity **of their rights as human beings** within its jurisdiction **from its very inception as a nation even unto this very day that is the underline cause for**

relief herein ultimately stems. Centuries of raping, torturing, exploiting labor, kidnapping and killing millions of people have been perpetrated with the full protection of the governing American authorities for its designated citizens to abuse the aforementioned targeted fellow human beings with the result that, when the very existence of the unified sovereign nation was under threat to be fractured irreconcilably in a civil war, the defendant **THE UNITED STATES** SOLICITED THE ASSISTANCE OF THOSE VERY PEOPLE WHOM THEY HAVE TARGETED AND TORTURED FOR SO LONG. However, in acquiring victory with their military assistance, defendant **THE UNITED STATES** responded by codifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would maintain **the sub-human status** of this targeted population within its jurisdiction **in perpetuity**. The defendant **THE UNITED STATES**' four hundred (400) year old **American Apartheid** policies **in all its forms** that are codified, institutionalized and executed for the premeditated, perpetual systemic deprivation of human rights of a targeted population of human beings THAT ARE ANNOUNCED AS RACE-BASED that constitutes **CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY**. These race-based policies create two classes of citizens in the United States **even after the Civil War!** This requires remedy.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

8 U.S. Code § 1330 - Actions against foreign states

- (a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction without regard to amount in controversy of any nonjury civil action against a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title as to any claim for relief in personam with respect to which the foreign state is not entitled to immunity either under sections 1605–1607 of this title or under any applicable international agreement.
- (b) Personal jurisdiction over a foreign state shall exist as to every claim for relief over which the district courts have jurisdiction under subsection (a) where service has been made under section 1608 of this title.
- (c) For purposes of subsection (b), an appearance by a foreign state does not confer personal jurisdiction with respect to any claim for relief not arising out of any transaction or occurrence enumerated in sections 1605–1607 of this title.

28 U.S. Code § 1331 - Federal question

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

28 U.S. Code § 1332 - Diversity of citizenship; amount in controversy; costs

- (a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—(4) a foreign state, defined in section 1603(a) of this title, as plaintiff and citizens of a State or of different States.

28 U.S. Code § 1340 - Internal revenue; customs duties

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress providing for internal revenue, or revenue from imports or tonnage except matters within the jurisdiction of the Court of International Trade.

28 U.S. Code § 1350 - Alien's action for tort

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action by an alien for a tort only, committed in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the United States.

28 U.S. Code § 1346 - United States as defendant

- (a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the United States Court of Federal Claims, of:
- (1) Any civil action against the United States for the recovery of any internal-revenue tax alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or any penalty claimed to

have been collected without authority or any sum alleged to have been excessive or in any manner wrongfully collected under the internal-revenue laws;

28 U.S. Code § 1350 - Alien's action for tort

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action by an alien for a tort only, committed in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the United States.

28 U.S. Code § 1361 - Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.

28 U.S. Code § 1367 - Supplemental jurisdiction

- (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) or as expressly provided otherwise by Federal statute, in any civil action of which the district courts have original jurisdiction, the district courts shall have supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution. Such supplemental jurisdiction shall include claims that involve the joinder or intervention of additional parties.
- (b) In any civil action of which the district courts have original jurisdiction founded solely on section 1332 of this title, the district courts shall not have supplemental jurisdiction under subsection (a) over claims by plaintiffs against persons made parties under Rule 14, 19, 20, or 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or over claims by persons proposed to be joined as plaintiffs under Rule 19 of such rules, or seeking to intervene as plaintiffs under Rule 24 of such rules, when exercising supplemental jurisdiction over such claims would be inconsistent with the jurisdictional requirements of section 1332.
- (c) The district courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim under subsection (a) if—
 - (1) the claim raises a novel or complex issue of State law,
 - (2) the claim substantially predominates over the claim or claims over which the district court has original jurisdiction,
 - (3) the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction, or
 - (4) in exceptional circumstances, there are other compelling reasons for declining jurisdiction.
- (d) The period of limitations for any claim asserted under subsection (a), and for any other claim in the same action that is voluntarily dismissed at the same time as or after the dismissal of the claim under subsection (a), shall be tolled while the claim is pending and for a period of 30 days after it is dismissed unless State law provides for a longer tolling period.

(e)As used in this section, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

28 U.S. Code § 1369 - Multiparty, multiform jurisdiction

(a)In General.—The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action involving minimal diversity between adverse parties that arises from a single accident, where at least 75 natural persons have died in the accident at a discrete location, if—

(1)a defendant resides in a State and a substantial part of the accident took place in another State or other location, regardless of whether that defendant is also a resident of the State where a substantial part of the accident took place;

(2)any two defendants reside in different States, regardless of whether such defendants are also residents of the same State or States; or

(3)substantial parts of the accident took place in different States.

(b)Limitation of Jurisdiction of District Courts.—The district court shall abstain from hearing any civil action described in subsection (a) in which—

(1)the substantial majority of all plaintiffs are citizens of a single State of which the primary defendants are also citizens; and

(2)the claims asserted will be governed primarily by the laws of that State.

(c)Special Rules and Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

(1)minimal diversity exists between adverse parties if any party is a citizen of a State and any adverse party is a citizen of another State, a citizen or subject of a foreign state, or a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title;

(2)a corporation is deemed to be a citizen of any State, and a citizen or subject of any foreign state, in which it is incorporated or has its principal place of business, and is deemed to be a resident of any State in which it is incorporated or licensed to do business or is doing business;

(3)the term “injury” means—

(A)physical harm to a natural person; and

(B)physical damage to or destruction of tangible property, but only if physical harm described in subparagraph (A) exists;

(4)the term “accident” means a sudden accident, or a natural event culminating in an accident, that results in death incurred at a discrete location by at least 75 natural persons; and

(5)the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(d)Intervening Parties.—

In any action in a district court which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under this section, any person with a claim arising from the accident described in subsection (a) shall be permitted to intervene as a party plaintiff in the action, even if that person could not have brought an action in a district court as an original matter.

(e) Notification of Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.—

A district court in which an action under this section is pending shall promptly notify the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation of the pendency of the action.

28 U.S. Code § 1402 - United States as defendant

(a) Any civil action in a district court against the United States under subsection (a) of section 1346 of this title may be prosecuted only:

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), in the judicial district where the plaintiff resides;

(2) In the case of a civil action by a corporation under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1346, in the judicial district in which is located the principal place of business or principal office or agency of the corporation; or if it has no principal place of business or principal office or agency in any judicial district (A) in the judicial district in which is located the office to which was made the return of the tax in respect of which the claim is made, or (B) if no return was made, in the judicial district in which lies the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph a district court, for the convenience of the parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer any such action to any other district or division.

(b) Any civil action on a tort claim against the United States under subsection (b) of section 1346 of this title may be prosecuted only in the judicial district where the plaintiff resides or wherein the act or omission complained of occurred.

(c) Any civil action against the United States under subsection (e) of section 1346 of this title may be prosecuted only in the judicial district where the property is situated at the time of levy, or if no levy is made, in the judicial district in which the event occurred which gave rise to the cause of action.

(d) Any civil action under section 2409a to quiet title to an estate or interest in real property in which an interest is claimed by the United States shall be brought in the district court of the district where the property is located or, if located in different districts, in any of such districts.

28 U.S. Code § 1449 - State court record supplied

Where a party is entitled to copies of the records and proceedings in any suit or prosecution in a State court, to be used in any district court of the United States, and the clerk of such State court, upon demand, and the payment or tender of the legal fees, fails to deliver certified copies, the district court may, on affidavit reciting such facts, direct such record to be supplied by affidavit or otherwise. Thereupon such proceedings, trial, and judgment may be had in such district court, and all such process awarded, as if certified copies had been filed in the district court.

28 U.S. Code § 1333 - Admiralty, maritime and prize cases

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of:

(1) Any civil case of admiralty or maritime jurisdiction, saving to suitors in all cases all other remedies to which they are otherwise entitled.

(2) Any prize brought into the United States and all proceedings for the condemnation of property taken as prize. and

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 9 (h)

PARTIES

2. a. **Plaintiff:** W.P. doing business as **WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

Address: Post Office Box #1367

29 Jay Street

Schenectady, New York , Zip Code Exempt [12305]

b. **Plaintiff: KINGDOM OF PRIESTS:** We the people brought to this land involuntary have been sanctified among the nations within the Judeo-Christian canon and further within the Constitution of the United States. These human beings in particular held in bondage in the Western Hemisphere have suffered the curses of Deuteronomy Chapter 28, **the signature identifiable vice** most relevant in the instance case is found in verse 68 thereof:

58If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; 59Then the LORD will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance. 60Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. 61Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the LORD bring upon thee,68**And the LORD shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships**, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you.

Deuteronomy 28:58-61,68

The title "KINGDOM OF PRIESTS" is one bestowed upon our nation, our people, when we fully embrace the covenant made by our forebearers and live out the tenets thereof:

And Moses went up unto God, and the LORD called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: 4Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and *how* I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. 5**Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant**, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine: 6**And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests**, and an holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.

Exodus 19:3-6

Let the record reflect we do so publicly reassert our covenant with THE GOD OF ABRAHAM herein and strive to keep that covenant at all times hereafter. The relief sought herein stems from the legacy of the disparity in STATUS this targeted population has had within the jurisdiction of the defendant THE UNITED STATES from its inception, and is evinced in defendant THE UNITED STATES' constitution, its policies derived therefrom and the practices instituted thereby both **before**

and **after** the era of chattel slavery and the conclusion of The Civil War. The defendant THE UNITED STATES has **systemically** denied rights under its Constitution otherwise extended to other human beings, most notably those of European heritage (*a.k.a* 'white people'). This is in spite of our shared genealogy (we too are sons and daughters of Adam & Eve). This is in spite of the defendant THE UNITED STATES' admission made in its founding documents (*...we hold these truths to be self-evident that **all men are created equal**.*"). We do hereby assert our rights **as human beings** with all of our GOD GIVEN RIGHTS to live our days in that very capacity within the jurisdiction of the defendant THE UNITED STATES and everywhere else our Creator (*THE GOD OF ABRAHAM*) has deem fit for HIS servants.

The address for KINGDOM OF PRIESTS is found above and shared with the member of this targeted class seeking to assert the GOD GIVEN rights (*meaning THE GOD OF ABRAHAM*) of this targeted population **as human beings** acknowledged among the family of nations in the treaties the defendant THE UNITED STATES is a party to.

*** The Defendants ***

3. a. Defendant: THE UNITED STATES

Official Position: defacto government of the United States of America

Address:

Civil Process Clerk

United States Attorney's Office for District of Columbia.
601 D Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

b. Defendant: INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Official Position: agent of defendant THE UNITED STATES

Address:

1111 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20224

c. **Defendant:** NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM

Address:

New York State Office of the Attorney General

The Capitol
Albany, NY 12224-0341
ATTN: A&O/Personal Service

New York State Secretary of State

New York Department of State's office at One Commerce Plaza,
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12231.

d. **Defendant:** NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY SUPERVISION

Address:

New York State Office of the Attorney General

The Capitol
Albany, NY 12224-0341
ATTN: A&O/Personal Service

New York State Secretary of State

New York Department of State's office at One Commerce Plaza,
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12231.

FACTS

(SUMMARY OF THE FRAUDULENT SCHEME)

FACT#1 The people of African Heritage, those whose domicile remains upon the continent of Eden, as well as those who have migrated elsewhere, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, are all human beings.

FACT#2 The people of African Heritage, those whose domicile remains upon the continent of Eden, as well as those who have migrated elsewhere, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, are entitled to all of the rights endowed by Our Creator, THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, upon human beings in their very creation.

3. The controversy that exist in the instant complaint stems from the policies the defendant THE UNITED STATES has historically had it place to effectuate the denial of at least one of the aforementioned facts at all times within its jurisdiction and since that time amended to its constitution to further extend the DENIAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN PERPETUITY.
4. The first federal question presented to this court is precisely the same addressed to the United States Supreme Court in Dred Scott versus Sanford.

The question is simply this:

Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, **become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States,**
and as such
become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities,
guarantied by that instrument to the citizen?

5. The answer to this question is well settled when considering the three eras of American history where this very issue is raised and responded to definitively as the nation's official policy.

These are:

- A. Antebellum America (before 1861) -
 - the U.S. Supreme Court Dred Scott Decision;
- B. During the Civil War (1861-1865) -
 - the Emancipation Proclamation;
 - The 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution
- C. The Reconstruction Era & beyond (1865 – now) -
 - The Civil Rights Act of 1866
 - the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution;

We shall examine each of these separately.

Antebellum America

(before 1861)

6.

One of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution.

It will be observed, that the plea applies to that class of persons only whose ancestors were negroes of the African race, and imported into this country, and sold and held as slaves. The only matter in issue before the court, therefore, is, whether the descendants of such slaves, when they shall be emancipated, or who are born of parents who had become free before their birth, are citizens of a State, in the sense in which the word citizen is used in the Constitution of the United States. And this being the only matter in dispute on the pleadings, the court must be understood as speaking in this opinion of that class only, that is, of those persons who are the descendants of Africans who were imported into this country, and sold as slaves.

The situation of this population was altogether unlike that of the Indian race. The latter, it is true, formed no part of the colonial communities, and never amalgamated with them in social connections or in government. But although they were uncivilized, they were yet a free and independent people, associated together in nations or tribes, and governed by their own laws. Many of these political communities were situated in territories to which the white race claimed the ultimate right of dominion. But that claim was acknowledged to be subject to the right of the Indians to occupy it as long as they thought proper, and neither the English nor colonial Governments claimed or exercised any dominion over the tribe or nation by whom it was occupied, nor claimed the right to the possession of the territory, until the tribe or nation consented to cede it. These Indian Governments were regarded and treated as foreign Governments, as much so as if an ocean had separated the red man from the white; and their freedom has constantly been acknowledged, from the time of the first emigration to the English colonies to the present day, by the different Governments which succeeded each other. Treaties have been negotiated with them, and their alliance sought for in war; and the people who compose these Indian political communities have always been treated as foreigners not living under our Government. It is true that the course of

events has brought the Indian tribes within the limits of the United States under subjection to the white race; and it has been found necessary, for their sake as well as our own, to regard them as in a state of pupilage, and to legislate to a certain extent over them and the territory they occupy. But they may, without doubt, like the subjects of any other foreign Government, be naturalized by the authority of Congress, and become citizens of a State, and of the United States; and if an individual should leave his nation or tribe, and take up his abode among the white population, he would be entitled to all the rights and privileges which would belong to an emigrant from any other foreign people.

We proceed to examine the case as presented by the pleadings.

The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the 'sovereign people,' and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? **We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word 'citizens' in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States.** On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and **had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them.**

It is not the province of the court to decide upon the justice or injustice, the policy or impolicy, of these laws. The decision of that question belonged to the political or law-making power; to those who formed the sovereignty and framed the Constitution. The duty of the court is, to interpret the instrument they have framed, with the best lights we can obtain on the subject, and to administer it as we find it, according to its true intent and meaning when it was adopted.

Except from DRED SCOTT v. JOHN F. A. SANDFORD. 60 U.S. 393, 19 How. 393, 15 L.Ed. 691

7. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE the Dred Scott court conclusion expressed NOT ONLY was Dred Scott (and by implication those similarly situated, including but not limited to namely the Plaintiffs herein) in the word 'citizens' in the Constitution, but were NOT even intended to be included. The Plaintiffs lack of inclusion into the Constitution of the United States as part of the body politic is NO OVERSIGHT. This race-based public policy in the

nation's foundational document is what qualifies THE UNITED STATES fundamentally as an **apartheid** state.

8. Outside of some amendment to this historic document, the Constitution of the United States simply DOES NOT COUNT the Plaintiffs herein as constituent members of its body politic, its citizenry, the nation for which it was formed.

9. Moreover, the basis of this American policy is explained elsewhere in nouncertain terms to be rooted in RACE: "On the contrary, they were at the time considered as subordinate and had no rights or priviledges but such such as those ...might chose to grant them."

10. Within the jurisdiction of the United States there is no unalienable rights for the Plaintiff class endowed by the Creator. That is, the defendant THE UNITED STATES has historically NOT acknowledged the superceding rights as human beings even while it acknowledges GOD HIMSELF bestowed such rights upon all equally.

11. This is NOT a slavery based policy, but is explicit in its asseretion whether held as slaves or rendered free, the policy itself shall stand. Such deliberate, premeditated violations targeting entire segments of the human family because of race is what qualifies the defendant THE UNITED STATES four hundred year plus commitment to these policies CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

12. The opening federal question is definitely answered for all times that include the era before the American Civil War. The only question that remains open is whether the historic Dred Scott court decision been rescinded by some other American policy or constitutional amendment for contemporary descendants of slaves to assert their human rights thereby? Has the status of the Plaintiffs class changed substantively during the American Civil War? Does the conclusion of overt forms of chattel slavery in America also imply the dissoloution of its two-tiered Aparthied social regime?

13. The aforementioned Dred Scott court decision is definitive with its language ("whether slave or free": So what do we make of the Emancipation Proclamation wherein then existing President Abraham Lincoln deemed all those held in bondage in the states that seceded from the Union are henceforth free. For most, the truth in that statement is NOT echoed, nor its implications emphasized.

14. The fine print in Abraham Lincoln's proclamation applies to those who have declared themselves outside of the jurisdiction of the United States. This can be likened unto *your parents giving you permission to stay out all night the day you move into a home of your very own Their authority over what you simply no longer applies. Their proclamation as the former control are on their face render moot.*

15. Abraham Lincoln himself was indifferent on the issue :

. There is a general historic presumption that the institution of slavery was dismantled in America at the conclusion of its Civil War in 1865. This popularized misunderstanding of history helps maintain the illusion that **SLAVERY** no longer exists in the United States. Ending slavery was **NEVER** the intention of Abraham Lincoln, *the American president known as "the Great Emancipator"*:

"I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that **there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will for ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality.** And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Abraham Lincoln ,*September 18, 1858.*

16. These polarizing sentiments by the then presiding President of the United States telegraph the true intentions of Abraham Lincoln in his so called "**EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION**" (*see attached*).

It was only when Lincoln feared losing the Civil War that he freed the enslaved Africans located in the South:

"If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it,... What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union."

Abraham Lincoln (1862)

17. The attorney vested in this *Commander-in-Chief* understood all too well the full implications of the stratified jargon employed in this historic document. The language polarizing human beings into **people** and **persons** in the **EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION** embodies the spirit of enmity and hatred required for the perpetuation of the parasitic relationship Europeans & Africans beyond the conclusion of the Civil War.

18. In a meeting with Black leaders on August 14, 1862, Lincoln tried to persuade his listeners to establish a colony of free black people in Central America. Speaking on behalf of white people, Lincoln said: **"There is an unwillingness on the part of our people, harsh as it may be, for you free colored people to remain with us If intelligent colored men, such as are before me, would move in this matter, much might be accomplished. It is exceedingly important that we have men at the beginning capable of thinking as white men."** *Special Field Order #15* is those sentiments materialized (*see EXHIBIT B*).

19. The President of the United States required the military assistance of the African military held in bondage in order to secure the continued union of the entire country. **THAT ASSISTANCE WAS NOT WITHOUT A PRICE.** By the President's admission,

there were negotiations with leaders of the African nation held against their will. Victory was secured for President Lincoln **only** with their assistance. Compensation for the necessary agreed upon African military services are found in *Special Order #15* and to date that debt **REMAINS OUTSTANDING**.

20. The Africans held in bondage were never counted among "WE THE PEOPLE", neither are their descendents enveloped in the expression "WE THE PEOPLE" nowadays (*rest in peace George Floyd*). The nation founded upon social inequality has maintained **A SEGREGATION OF INTEREST POLICY** particularly when concerning the interest of the targeted people of African Heritage complaining herein. In response, WE, the proud people of **the continent of Eden**, members of the first family of humanity and descendants of Adam & Eve have been compelled to secure our own interest and protect ourselves from the American government's cannibalizing economic interest.

21. Yet this President is regarded as the Great Emancipator. How disrespectful is that to all those, both black and white, who gave their lives in the struggle for human suffrage. How Offensive is that appellation in wake of John Brown's sacrifices at Harper's Ferry, or Presidents' John F. Kennedy and Andrew Jackson commitment to the American people. Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation left slavery undisturbed and intact in Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri. Wherever a slave state did NOT secede from the Union, slavery remain undisturbed.

*During the Civil War
(1861-1865)*

22. **STATUS.** The era that is the American Civil War certainly brought with it reformation in the lives of many people, both black and white, living in America. The dissolution of overt forms of chattel slavery as it is proposed on the 1st day of January, 1863 in the Emancipation Proclamation and further enhanced on the ___ - day of January 1865 when Congress passed the 13th Amendment

of the United States Constitution and ratified it on the 6th day of December of the same year goes a long way to create the idea that somehow race relations can be normalized in the United States with these policies enacted to supplement the nation's Apartheid regime Constitution. Still, the issue maintained herein is dictated by the federal question presented to the Dred Scott Court in the original instance. That is -

The question is simply this:

Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, **become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States,**
and as such
become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities,
 guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen?

23. We shall examine the impact each of these Civil War policies had in modifying America's Dred Scott Decision as the nation's policy respectively.

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION:

24. Abraham Lincoln is regarded in American pop culture as the herald of freedom for African people held in bondage in America and celebrated as the Great Emancipator, when in actuality, a careful reading of his historic proclamation does NOT end slavery AT ALL with the jurisdiction for the United States, but to the contrary, declares those who are held in bondage in the states that have seceded are henceforth set free!

25. Lincoln's indifference to the plight of African people suffering is self evident in the statement he has proclaimed during the course of his political career. Abraham Lincoln, Commander-In-Chief- was by trade an attorney-at-law and as such, understood all too well the full implications in the legal jargon used concerning "people" in stark contrast to "persons".

26. In responding to the Emancipation Proclamation's impact on the Plaintiff's legal status within the United States, on its face, it is simply irrelevant. The Dred Scott court decision is clear in its description that there is a schism between those people for whom the body politic was formed that constitutes the United States and those held in bondage by them, that "the negro race is regarded as an entire separate class of persons from those comparably with white people:

DRED SCOTT, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

v.

JOHN F. A. SANDFORD. 60 U.S. 393
19 How. 393
15 L.Ed. 691

December Term, 1856

Plea to the Jurisdiction of the Court.

APRIL TERM, 1854.

And the said John F. A. Sandford, in his own proper person, comes and says that this court ought not to have or take further cognizance of the action aforesaid, because he says that said cause of action, and each and every of them, (if any such have accrued to the said Dred Scott,) accrued to the said Dred Scott out of the jurisdiction of this court, and exclusively within the jurisdiction of the courts of the State of Missouri, for that, to wit: the said plaintiff, Dred Scott, is not a citizen of the State of Missouri, as alleged in his declaration, because he is a negro of African descent; his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as negro slaves, and this the said Sandford is ready to verify. Wherefore, he prays judgment whether this court can or will take further cognizance of the action aforesaid.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to determine who were citizens of the several States when the Constitution was adopted. And in order to do this, we must recur to the Governments and institutions of the thirteen colonies, when they separated from Great Britain and formed new sovereignties, and took their places in the family of independent nations. We must inquire who, at that time, were recognised as the people or citizens of a State, whose rights and liberties had been outraged by the English Government; and who declared their independence, and assumed the powers of Government to defend their rights by force of arms.

In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then

acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument.

It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted. But the public history of every European nation displays it in a manner too plain to be mistaken.

They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever a profit could be made by it. This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing, or supposed to be open to dispute; and men in every grade and position in society daily and habitually acted upon it in their private pursuits, as well as in matters of public concern, without doubting for a moment the correctness of this opinion.

And in no nation was this opinion more firmly fixed or more uniformly acted upon than by the English Government and English people. They not only seized them on the coast of Africa, and sold them or held them in slavery for their own use; but they took them as ordinary articles of merchandise to every country where they could make a profit on them, and were far more extensively engaged in this commerce than any other nation in the world....

....And 'that none of her Majesty's English or Scottish subjects, nor of any other Christian nation, within this province, shall contract matrimony with any negro or mulatto; nor shall any person, duly authorized to solemnize marriage, presume to join any such in marriage, on pain of forfeiting the sum of fifty pounds; one moiety thereof to her Majesty, for and towards the support of the Government within this province, and the other moiety to him or them that shall inform and sue for the same, in any of her Majesty's courts of record within the province, by bill, plaint, or information.'

We give both of these laws in the words used by the respective legislative bodies, because the language in which they are framed, as well as the provisions contained in them, show, too plainly to be misunderstood, the degraded condition of this unhappy race. They were still in force when the Revolution began, and are a faithful index to the state of feeling towards the class of persons of whom they speak, and of the position they occupied throughout the thirteen colonies, in the eyes and thoughts of the men who framed the Declaration of Independence and established the State Constitutions and Governments. They show that a perpetual and impassable barrier was intended to be erected between the white race and the one which they had reduced to slavery, and governed as subjects with absolute and despotic power, and which they then looked upon as so far below them in the scale of created beings, that intermarriages between white persons and negroes or mulattoes were regarded as

unnatural and immoral, and punished as crimes, not only in the parties, but in the person who joined them in marriage. And no distinction in this respect was made between the free negro or mulatto and the slave, but this stigma, of the deepest degradation, was fixed upon the whole race.

We refer to these historical facts for the purpose of showing the fixed opinions concerning that race, upon which the statesmen of that day spoke and acted. It is necessary to do this, in order to determine whether the general terms used in the Constitution of the United States, as to the rights of man and the rights of the people, was intended to include them, or to give to them or their posterity the benefit of any of its provisions.

The language of the Declaration of Independence is equally conclusive:

It begins by declaring that, 'when in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.'

It then proceeds to say: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among them is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.'

The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day would be so understood. But it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration; for if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted; and instead of the sympathy of mankind, to which they so confidently appealed, they would have deserved and received universal rebuke and reprobation.

Yet the men who framed this declaration were great men—high in literary acquirements—high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others; and they knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world be supposed to embrace the negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized Governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery. They spoke and acted according to the then established doctrines and principles, and in the ordinary language of the day, and no one misunderstood them. The unhappy black race were separated from the white by indelible marks, and laws long before established, and were never thought of or spoken of except as property, and when the claims of the owner or the profit of the trader were supposed to need protection.

This state of public opinion had undergone no change when the Constitution was adopted, as is equally evident from its provisions and language.

The brief preamble sets forth by whom it was formed, for what purposes, and for whose benefit and protection. It declares that it is formed by the people of the United States; that is to say,

by those who were members of the different political communities in the several States; and its great object is declared to be to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. It speaks in general terms of the people of the United States, and of citizens of the several States, when it is providing for the exercise of the powers granted or the privileges secured to the citizen. It does not define what description of persons are intended

to be included under these terms, or who shall be regarded as a citizen and one of the people. It uses them as terms so well understood, that no further description or definition was necessary.

But there are two clauses in the Constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of persons, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the Government then formed.

One of these clauses reserves to each of the thirteen States the right to import slaves until the year 1808, if it thinks proper. And the importation which it thus sanctions was unquestionably of persons of the race of which we are speaking, as the traffic in slaves in the United States had always been confined to them. And by the other provision the States pledge themselves to each other to maintain the right of property of the master, by delivering up to him any slave who may have escaped from his service, and be found within their respective territories. By the first above-mentioned clause, therefore, the right to purchase and hold this property is directly sanctioned and authorized for twenty years by the people who framed the Constitution. And by the second, they pledge themselves to maintain and uphold the right of the master in the manner specified, as long as the Government they then formed should endure. And these two provisions show, conclusively, that neither the description of persons therein referred to, nor their descendants, were embraced in any of the other provisions of the Constitution; for certainly these two clauses were not intended to confer on them or their posterity the blessings of liberty, or any of the personal rights so carefully provided for the citizen.

No one of that race had ever migrated to the United States voluntarily; all of them had been brought here as articles of merchandise. The number that had been emancipated at that time were but few in comparison with those held in slavery; and they were identified in the public mind with the race to which they belonged, and regarded as a part of the slave population rather than the free. It is obvious that they were not even in the minds of the framers of the Constitution when they were conferring special rights and privileges upon the citizens of a State in every other part of the Union.

Indeed, when we look to the condition of this race in the several States at the time, it is impossible to believe that these rights and privileges were intended to be extended to them.

27. The very definition of “persons” reflects the two classes of “citizen” described in the Constitution of the United States.

Legal Definition of PERSON:

Dred Scott and all those similarly are presumed by the defendant THE UNITED STATES to fit into the latter.

28. This is what the racist American Apartheid regime bolster in their constitution, a two-tiered race based citizenship policy:

No one, we presume, supposes that any change in public opinion or feeling, in relation to this unfortunate race, in the civilized nations of Europe or in this country, should induce the court to give to the words of the Constitution a more liberal construction in their favor than they were intended to bear when the instrument was framed and adopted. Such an argument would be altogether inadmissible in any tribunal called on to interpret it. If any of its provisions are deemed unjust, there is a mode prescribed in the instrument itself by which it may be amended; but while it remains unaltered, it must be construed now as it was understood at the time of its adoption. It is not only the same in words, but the same in meaning, and delegates the same powers to the Government, and reserves and secures the same rights and privileges to the citizen; and as long as it continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only in the same words, but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of this court, and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day. This court was not created by the Constitution for such purposes. Higher and graver trusts have been confided to it, and it must not falter in the path of duty.

112

What the construction was at that time, we think can hardly admit of doubt. We have the language of the Declaration of Independence and of the Articles of Confederation, in addition to the plain words of the Constitution itself; we have the legislation of the different States, before, about the time, and since, the Constitution was adopted; we have the legislation of Congress, from the time of its adoption to a recent period; and we have the constant and uniform action of the Executive Department, all concurring together, and leading to the same result.

And if anything in relation to the construction of the Constitution can be regarded as settled, it is that which we now give to the word 'citizen' and the word 'people.'

113

And upon a full and careful consideration of the subject, the court is of opinion, that, upon the facts stated in the plea in abatement, **Dred Scott was not a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and not entitled as such to sue in its courts;** and, consequently, that the Circuit Court had no jurisdiction of the case, and that the judgment on the plea in abatement is erroneous.

29. Thus the Great Emancipator in writing that proclamation actually liberated little to none among the Plaintiff class. And what of the 13th Amendment TO THE constitution?

Here in a plain reading of its text reveals neither slavery nor involuntary servitude is abolished within the United States, but made conditional. That is, the institution of American slavery remains constitutional, as is involuntarily servitude, so long as the preconditions for such imputed status are met in the original instance.

30. The nation enriched by slavery did NOT seek some other primary means by which to further enrich itself, but instead, to become more effective and efficient at the oppressive conditions slavery/involuntary servitude. What are these constitutional conditions?

31. The first is described explicitly in the Amendment itself (...except as a punishment ...)

It is these CONDITIONS presumed to be placed as prerequisites for slavery/involuntary servitude that waxes away the mounting resistance to the entire exploitation of human beings that requires their subjugation.

32. It therefore should be no surprise that since the enactment of the 13th Amendment, there has been a concerted, government effect to induce those very conditions among the targeted

population by whatever means available to them. The history of the resulting criminal justice policies reflect the shift towards incarcerating black people.

33. The second condition is hidden in plain sight and is revealed implicitly. That is, to determine the other way one can become a slave or be subject to involuntary servitude, one must make the correct inference to draw out its truth. The United States supreme court provides a window of opportunity for slavery to constitutionally be deemed legal wherever that subordinate condition is entered into VOLUNTARILY!!!! (see below):

U.S. Supreme Court

The Antelope, 23 U.S. 10 Wheat. 66 66 (1825)

...In the United States, different opinions have been entertained in the different circuits and districts, and the subject is now, for the first time, before this Court.

The question whether the slave trade is prohibited by the law of nations has been seriously propounded, and both the affirmative and negative of the proposition have been maintained with equal earnestness.

That it is contrary to the law of nature will scarcely be denied. **That every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor is generally admitted, and that no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits and appropriate them against his will seems to be the necessary result of this admission.** But from the earliest times, war has existed, and war confers rights in which all have acquiesced. Among the most enlightened nations of antiquity, one of these was that the victor might enslave the vanquished. This, which was the usage of all, could not be pronounced repugnant to the law of nations, which is certainly to be tried by the test of general

Page 23 U. S. 121

usage. That which has received the assent of all must be the law of all.

Slavery, then, has its origin in force; but as the world has agreed that it is a legitimate result of force, **the state of things which is thus produced by general consent cannot be pronounced unlawful.**

34. In either case, DOES the 13th Amendment in and of itself alter the status of the Plaintiff here and those similarly situated (e.g. Dred Scott, his wife and his daughters) legally within the jurisdiction of the United States?

35. The federal question is resolved precisely in the manner the Dred Scott court determined, in that emancipation from slavery in and of itself does NOT liberate one from the subjugation the defendant THE UNITED STATES imposes but the subordinate status is rooted in race, whether slave or free.

36. Although no longer held in forcible bondage, the 13th Amendment does NOT on its face restore the presumption Europeans used to impose the subobordinate condition in the original instance. The 13th Amendment does NOT dissolve the inequality between the races, but only place conditions upon which those in the designated American subordinated class could be regarded as such.

37. It is not enough for those formerly held in bondage to simply NOT be considered slaves in order to actively participate in the body politic that is the United States. Legislation affirmatively establishing the nature of the relationships between those formerly forcibly held in bondage and those responsible for that condition. Such legislation is enacted in the years following the American Civil War and beyond.

38. This last portion of our timeline, from the Reconstruction Era to the present day includes the current legal status of the Plaintiffs, presumed to be acquired via the 14th Amendment. We shall examine this amendment's impact on the Dred Scott federal question where the question of the status of this target population.

The Reconstruction Era & beyond (1862 – now)

39. In the days after the conclusion of the Civil War, there was an effort made by some to include those formerly held in bondage as full participants into the body politic AS EQUALS. This effort by sincere some sincere people, both black and white, manifested itself in

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1866.

40. Provisions made herein are explicit with equating the designated rights of the targeted class, namely with that of “white people”. However, it was argued such provisions are outside the meaning of the Constitution as it was then understood. Provisions made herein are explicit with equating the designated rights with that of “white people”.

41. The racist principles and beliefs found in the Dred Scott court decision were very influential. What legislation would serve as bedrock of this targeted population admission into the body politic. What has been extended is yet another amendment to the Constitution beyond the 13th Amendment’s conditional slavery/involuntary servitude provisions. The next remedy sought to supplement the defendant’ THE UNITED STATES RACIST Constitution is found in the 14th Amendment.

42. So in reviewing its txt, we raise the federal question presented to the Dred Scott court in the origin instance for yet a third time. That is:

The question is simply this:

Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, **become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States,**

and as such

become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen?

43. When relying upon the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution, the answer is conclusive. Those who are designated “U.S. citizens” by way of the 14th Amendment are awarded ~~privileges and immunities but this amendment, however, what is conspicuously missing from the~~ language in the 14th Amendment is any mention of any RIGHTS, particularly an acknowledgment of those unalienable RIGHTS bestowed upon human beings.

44. ~~The inference to be drawn is NO SUCH RIGHTS ARE MENTIONED BECAUSE NO SUCH RIGHTS ARE MADE APPLICABLE TO 14TH AMENDMENT U.S. CITIZENS.~~

43. Recall, the Plaintiffs and those similarly situated are according to the Dred Scott court decision “...an entire different class of people”.

45. In short, these human beings for whom the 14th Amendment is intended for application are individually regarded as ARTIFICIAL PERSONS which is consistent with the property status they heretofore were imputed pursuant the United States Constitution.

46. The notion of a volunteer slave is absolutely repugnant to the assertion of rights as a human being endowed by our Creator. To adherents of Natural Law, the notion of voluntary slavery is actually oxymoronic. Our natural condition as members of the Kingdom of Priests is to respect the authority of our Creator and adhere to the covenant established with HIM with our forbearers and is evinced in a religious practice written in the flesh via circumcision (*see Genesis 17:10–14*).

47. Our identity as a nation **precluded the arrival in the Americas** and is not defined by the Constitution nor the experiences suffered in the involuntarily transport to this land.

48. Once those who held us forcibly in bondage took it upon themselves to cease and desist the use of force to maintain that slave condition after centuries of captivity, the license to access of the resources generated among ourselves (e.g., labor, capital, etc...) is also removed.

49. The continued interaction between these two factions is founded upon the premise that after the president of the united states solicited hundreds of thousands of soldiers in miliarty aid to maintain the Union, that agreement was made upon the condition that we be fully integrated into the body politic as citizens within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States. Implied therein is the obvious expectation our RIGHTS AS HUMAN BEINGS would be acknowledged and on par with the Europeans (a.k.a. "white people") in the body politic. This expectation is manifested in the Civil Rights Act of 1866 wherein he rights of "white people" is mentioned explicitly.

50. In NO uncertain terms was there any agreement, implied or otherwise, that our status in America henceforth would be less than of any other human being in general, and of European Americans (a.k.a white people) in particular in the body politic. But this legislature fall shor of the authority establish in the Constitution and wherever it conflicts with the law of the land, it necessarily struck down as unconstitutional.

51. The 14th Amendment is presumed to be the legal remedy that has always escaped the Plaintiffs and those similarly situated situated in the jurisdiction of the defendant the United States. Thus the federal question presented to the Dred Scott court is raised yet again in lue of the addition of the 14th Amendment of the United States?

52. How does this impact the legal STATUS of those formerly held in bondage and their descendants , those who are outside of the body politic of the nation that is the United States?

Does the 14th Amendment provide a legal remedy **for Dred Scott's lack of jurisdiction** because he was NOT a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States?

By that very court's own reasoning, **absolutely NOT!!!!!!**

53.

And even as late as 1820, (chap. 104, sec. 8,) in the charter to the city of Washington, the corporation is authorized 'to restrain and prohibit the nightly and other disorderly meetings of slaves, free negroes, and mulattoes,' thus associating them together in its legislation; and after prescribing the punishment that may be inflicted on the slaves, proceeds in the following words: 'And to punish such free negroes and mulattoes by penalties not exceeding twenty dollars for any one offence; and in case of the inability of any such free negro or mulatto to pay any such penalty and cost thereon, to cause him or her to be confined to labor for any time not exceeding six calendar months.' And in a subsequent part of the same section, the act authorizes the corporation 'to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which free negroes and mulattoes may reside in the city.'

This law, like the laws of the States, shows that this class of persons were governed by special legislation directed expressly to them, **and always connected with provisions for the government of slaves, and not with those for the government of free white citizens.** And after such an uniform course of legislation as we have stated, by the colonies, by the States, and by Congress, running through a period of more than a century, **it would seem that to call persons thus marked and stigmatized, 'citizens' of the United States, 'fellow-citizens,' a constituent part of the sovereignty, would be an abuse of terms, and not calculated to exalt the character of an American citizen in the eyes of other nations.**

Except from DRED SCOTT, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

v.

JOHN F. A. SANDFORD.

60 U.S. 393

19 How. 393

15 L.Ed. 691

December Term, 1856

54. The injuries suffered by the Plaintiffs at all times since the approval and ratification of the 14th Amendment stems from the illusion of the status of CITIZEN as it had previously been

established applies to white people of the body politic that is the United States, but does so only superficially, that is in title.

55. ~~The substantive rights of the white people within the United States are NOT encapsulated~~ in the 14th Amendment. Chief among these are the unalienable rights endowed by our Creator, our Natural Creator.

56. An assigner can assign no greater right than it has NOR can an assignee obtain a right greater than that held by the assignor

57. The rights held by the people are by the founder's own admission endowed by their Creator. The government has assumed its powers from the people including the power to from institution necessary for the advance the collective interest of the people who have entrusted that authority.

58. However, what in that authority bestows government the right to sit as our Creator? Or as the creator of people? Where did it inherit this capacity to sit in the seat reserved for GOD? The people cannot assign that right because GOD has NOT granted it to them.

59. The creation of individuals is an ecclesiastical capacity not otherwise authorities in. To manipulate the elements on the periodic table does NOT a GOD make. To bring into existence the heretofore have never existed from nothingness is a matter of an entire capacity know only to exist with GOD HIMSELF.

60. Because people do NOT have that capacity nor the right to do so, they in turn cannot bestow upon the government that capacity, or the right to do so.

61. Thus, the government AS ASSIGNEE of the people's sovereign authority has no capacity nor any right to create individuals, whether "persons" or "people".

62. This is consistent with the maxim

An assignee can be in no better position that the assignor was prior to the assignment.

63. Where the people are themselves created by GOD, and enjoy the right bestowed upon them, at best the government can enjoy the rights bestowed by GD in the original instance.

64. It is in violating these fundamental tenets of ASSIGNMENT in connection with Contract Law that the Government operates with impunity when it has no lawful or legal license to IMPUTING OBLIGATIONS (e.g., income taxes) when contract law permits only assignment of rights.

65. Leaving obligor worse off by virtue of the assignment when they should NOT be. It is NOT possible by assignment to increase or vary the obligations or burdens of an obligor.

66. As the subject matter of "Assignment" deals with the nature of the TRANSFER OF RIGHTS

*** NEMO DAT RULE ***

NO ONE CAN GIVE YOU WHAT THEY DO NOT HAVE.

67. The people of the United States are NOT themselves their own Creator, thus they cannot transfer the capacity to serve as creator to the state.

68. Nor can the defendant THE UNITED STATES act in any capacity as the creator of individual human beings over at least the Plaintiffs herein, THE KINGDOM OF PRIESTS,

because we have an ancient covenant that forbids the acknowledgment of another deity outside of the true Creator, THE GOD OF ABRAHAM.

69. When the Plaintiffs refuse to volunteer to be admitted to the American body politic as substantive slaves who enjoy the title of U.S. citizens via the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, we are by its Constitution have historically been treated as foreign to the body politic and simply maintain that status as alien to the 14th amendment class of citizens.

70. There is nothing in the context of the Constitution itself that provides any explicit notice the word citizen varies in meaning within the context of that very document. In fact, legislatures have taken great measures NOT to reveal the whole truth about this this matter, however, when the defendant THE UNITED STATES incorporated the municipality that includes the District of Columbia, city of Washington.

71. Decided to refer to the new corporate municipality for the District of Columbia “THE UNITED STATES”.

72. Then the invitation to become citizens of ‘THE UNITED STATES’ to the target population necessarily made in bad faith. The United States Supreme Court’s own statement magnifies the deliberateness in this effort as the reference”

73. The secrecy surrounding this effort to legally keep the entire class of “negroes” slaves ‘voluntarily’ is in the application of an ACT OF CONGRESS that requires voluntary EXPATRIATION IN order to effectuate the 14th Amendment citizenship. Those upon the land within the jurisdiction of the United States are secretly provided the legal loophole to transport them from the land to some alternative UNITED STATES, one that exist ENS LEGIS, a corporate

UNITED STATES established in 1871 as the government for the District of Columbia (see *STOUTENBURGH v. HENNICK*, 129 U.S. 141 (1889)).

74. This ACT OF CONGRESS establishes the existence of two separate and distinct governing authorities in America, each identified by the homonym "the United States". The first is established on September 17, 1787 with the adoption of "the Constitution for the united States of America". The second was established on February 21, 1871 to provide a government for the District of Columbia and has as its founding document "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES".

75 The legal loophole this strategy exercises secretly is that citizens can abandon their human being status voluntarily BUT WITHOUT THEIR KNOWLEDGE. One can transfer from the original country to the corporate entity by way of the 14th Amendment.

76. The defendant THE UNITED STATES, now a municipal corporation governing from Washington D.C., thereafter began to put in place policies and institutions that apply to the 14th Amendment slave class in stark contrast to the people-citizen class.

**U.S. Supreme Court
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)
Downes v. Bidwell
No. 507**

**Argued January 8-11, 1901
Decided May 27, 1901 182 U.S. 244**

By MR. JUSTICE GRAY.

The civil government of the United States cannot extend immediately and of its own force over territory acquired by war. Such territory must necessarily, in the first instance, be governed by the military power under the control of the President as commander in chief. Civil government cannot take effect at once as soon as possession is acquired under military authority, or even as soon as that possession is confirmed by treaty. It can only be put in operation by the action of the appropriate political department of the government at such time and in such degree as that department may determine.

In a conquered territory, civil government must take effect either by the action of the treaty-making power or by that of the Congress of the United States. The office of a treaty of cession ordinarily is to put an end to all authority of the foreign government over the territory, and to subject the territory to the disposition of the government of the United States.

The government and disposition of territory so acquired belong to the government of the United States, consisting of the President, the Senate,

Page 182 U. S. 247

elected by the states, and the House of Representatives, chosen by and immediately representing the people of the United States.

So long as Congress has not incorporated the territory into the United States, neither military occupation nor cession by treaty makes the conquered territory domestic territory in the sense of the revenue laws. But those laws concerning "foreign countries" remain applicable to the conquered territory until changed by Congress.

If Congress is not ready to construct a complete government for the conquered territory, it may establish a

77. Chief among these is the so-called INCOME TAX found in the 16th AMENDMENT to the Constitution.

78. Before the advent of the 14 Amendment, a tax levied upon the income of people, upon the constitutional citizens of the United States created by the Creator of human beings was deemed unconstitutional.

79. However, in the post 14th Amendment era, congress has deemed itself fit to create a so-called a “U.S. citizen”, the entity itself which is NOT natural, but voluntary to exist as an artificial entity.

80. These corporate citizens have no rights endowed by their creator, **the state**, as is self-evident in the 14 amendment itself.

81. These corporate citizens are presumed to have volunteered to live as artificial entities, and as such, are compelled to pay their income ‘tax’ to the state.

82. In this way the defendant THE UNITED STATES, a corporation, has usurped the unalienable rights endowed by our Natural Creator.

83. It is by way of the 14th Amendment the defendant THE UNITED STATES has completely changed the relationship between people and the governing authority.

84. Where THE UNITED STATES government derives its authority from the people, the 14th Amendment U.S. citizens derive their authority from the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

85. The perpetuation of this secret is made self-evident in the application of the 16th Amendment.

86. "People" made by our Natural Creator do NOT pay income taxes, 14th Amendment persons do.

87. The absence of NOTICE to the target population about their privileged slave status is evinced in the case of SHERRY PEEL JACKSON, A DECORATED I.R.S. agent was sentenced to four years in a federal prison for failing to file income taxes.

88. SHERRY PEEL JACKSON was never put on NOTICE her status as a 14 Amendment U.S. citizen is the source of her tax liability. As a descendant of slaves and a 14th Amendment U.S. Citizen, the Supreme Court decisions in reference to "people" simply to NOT apply. And are irrelevant to the obligations of those deemed created by the state itself.

89. The defendant THE UNITED STATES has the 14th Amendment of its constitution to usurp human beings' unalienable rights and now sits in relation to those it governs as their creator, their de facto GOD.

90. This TRANS ENS LEGIS SLAVE TRADE where human beings are by the Constitution of the United States demoted from existing as a human being with rights by our Natural Creator to existing as a corporate entity with only the so-called privileges and immunities the government deems fitting to grant and parallels the contrast of THE LAW OF MOSES and that of THE LAW OF FAITH found in the New Testament.

91. Where it can be shown the defendant, THE UNITED STATES is using its authority to effectuate VATICAN papal bulls concerning TESTIMONIAL TRUSTS, the government of the United States, a corporation:

- a) Violates its own constitution;
- b) Violates the public trust.

c) Commits treason.

92. Evidence of this activity is evinced with the procedure associated with obtaining a BIRTH CERTIFICATE and the documents used and distributed in response to this transaction.

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

93. The latest manifestation of this pretext for abuse of government authority is found yet again with a change in the jargon used to effectuate the same objective, to have members of the target class subjected to confinement for the financial benefit of the state and federal government. In New York State, prisoners have adopted the title inmates and prisons changed to correctional facilities.

94. However, the plan includes legislature provision to migrate from inmate to patient under the guise of mental health concerns. And the tenacity with which prisoners and inmates redress the conditions in bondage and challenges for the cause upon which involuntary servitude is imposed in the original instance are all extinguished as PATIENTS are deemed legally incompetent and require a third party to serve as an advocate on their behalf.

95. The history of abuse licensed and exercised by the defendant THE UNITED STATES against the Plaintiffs is also well documented and includes abuses in the medical field.

96. The defendant THE UNITED STATES government has within its possession patented technology that alters the mind states of human beings (see below):

There has been a dramatic rise in the number of technology patents filed that relate to reading brainwaves.

W Fewer than 400 so-called neuro-technology patents a year had been filed in 2000-09, research company SharpBrains said. But that had doubled to 800 in 2010. And 1,400 such patents had been lodged in the US in 2014.

97. The defendant THE UNITED STATES has within its possession patented an assortment of psychopharmaceuticals to deploy against the Plaintiffs all times and further includes mental health elements or further induce mental health issues where no such mental health issues hereto for existed.

98. In the wake of the defendant THE UNITED STATES 400+ year old history of continual racial hatred and abuse, it is NOT completely unfounded to conclude that the government which had shifted its overt abusive forms of exploitation should hereinafter NOT use the technology within its possession to further enhance its historic objections.

99. These abuses by the defendant the United States suffered collectively and individually by the Plaintiffs and those similarly situated.

100. This form of redress has ensued.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

Breach Of Implied Contract Of Good Faith And Fair Dealing

100. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

101. In New York, within every contract is an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The covenant is breached when a party acts in a manner that deprives the other party of the right to receive benefits under their agreement.

102. The covenant encompasses any promises which a reasonable person in the position of the promisee would be justified in understanding were included. See

511 West 232nd Owners Corp. v. Jennifer Realty Co., 98 N.Y.2d 144, 153, 746 N.Y.S.2d 131, 773 N.E.2d 496 (N.Y. 2002); *Dalton v. Educational Testing Serv.*, 87 N.Y.2d 384, 389, 639 N.Y.S.2d 977, 663 N.E.2d 289 (N.Y. 1995); *Frankini v. Landmark Constr. of Yonkers, Inc.*, 91 A.D.3d 593, 595, 937 N.Y.S.2d 80 (2d Dep't 2012); *Ochal v. Television Tech. Corp.*, 26 A.D.3d 575, 576, 809 N.Y.S.2d 604; Leon C. Lazer, et al., *New York Pattern Jury Instructions – Civil* § 4.1 (2d ed. 2006).

103. Further, in New York, every contract or duty relating to the present or future sale of goods, and every other contract or duty within the New York Uniform Commercial Code, “imposes an obligation of good faith in its performance or enforcement.” N.Y. U.C.C. § 1-203; see *id.* §§ 1-105(1), 2-102, 2-106(1). ” ‘Good faith’ means honesty in fact in the conduct or transaction concerned.” N.Y. U.C.C. § 1-201(19).
104. In the case of a merchant engaged in a transaction in goods in New York, ” ‘Good faith’ . . . means honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade.” N.Y. U.C.C. § 2-103(1)(b); see *id.* § 2-104(1) (defining ” [m]erchant ”); *id.* § 2-102.
105. The Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated domiciled upon the land in the region of North America that is designated to be the jurisdiction of the state of New York, at all times, presume they reside within the borders of that state of New York which declared independence from England and entered the union of the united States of America in the 18th century.
106. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did construct the 14th Amendment of its Constitution with the presumption it was to aid those previously held in bondage, their descendants, and those similarly situated to enter the body politic they had heretofore been denied access to as citizens thereof.
107. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did use constitutional terminology including “the United States” and “citizens” within the 14th Amendment thereby inducing a

reasonable person to conclude the use of these terms is consistent with the use of the same language found previously within the text of the same document.

108. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did set forth 14th Amendment of the Constitution in bad faith as this amendment does NOT grant the Plaintiffs and those similarly situated the rights of citizenship as established among the so-called "white" people of the United States, those for whom the body politic was formed in the original instance.
109. This bad faith is magnified in the legal shortcomings the 14th Amendment of the United States has in comparison to the Civil Rights Act of 1866.
110. This bad faith is further magnified in the conspicuous absence of the use of the word "rights".
111. This bad faith is further magnified in the Dred Scott Court's decision that readily identifies the status of such individuals: "... it would seem that to call persons thus marked and stigmatized, 'citizens' of the United States, 'fellow-citizens,' a constituent part of the sovereignty, **would be an abuse of terms**, and not calculated to exalt the character of an American citizen in the eyes of other nations." (Ibid.).
112. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did solicit and received military assistance in the form of hundreds of thousands of soldiers to curtail its sovereign nation being fractured as a demonstration of good faith on the part of the Plaintiffs in spite of the centuries of oppressive conditions.
113. The performance of services accepted in good faith demand reciprocity on the part of the defendant THE UNITED STATES;
114. The acceptance of the services by the defendant THE UNITED STATES activates a duty, an obligation and a debt to the Plaintiffs and those similarly situated for inter alia its very existence as a united sovereign;

115. The Plaintiffs are justified in having and expectation of compensation for the services; and
116. As the benefits from these timely contributions from the nation's inception have been incalculable in amount and perpetual in endurance so too the reasonable value of the services offered by the Plaintiffs, in capital, labor and military assistance demand a perpetual compensation particularly in light of the wanton dishonor of terms they have heretofore been compensated with.
117. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

Conversion

118. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
119. Plaintiff's have a possessory right or interest in the property described in the birth certificate; and
120. Defendant THE UNITED STATES dominion over the property of the Plaintiffs, individually and collectively described in the birth certificate is derogation of plaintiff's rights.
121. Defendant THE UNITED STATES interference with the property of the Plaintiffs, individually and collectively, described in the birth certificate is derogation of plaintiff's rights
122. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

Emotional Distress, Intentional Infliction

123. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of American apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
124. The defendant THE UNITED STATES historic policies of race-based hatred and exploitation that includes, but is NOT limited to, those actions and policies premediated and deliberately exercised against a targeted segment of humanity however unprovoked not reciprocated constitutes extreme and outrageous conduct;
125. The defendant THE UNITED STATES historic policies of race-based hatred and exploitation that includes, but is NOT limited to, those actions and policies premediated and deliberately exercised against a targeted segment of humanity with intent to cause, or disregard of a substantial probability of causing, severe emotional distress at all times from at least 1620 to the present has resulted in injuries, emotional distress and deaths for generations;
126. There is a direct connection between the conduct and policies of the defendant THE UNITED STATES and injuries sustain by the Plaintiffs at all times from at least 1620 to the present; and
127. The Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated numbering in the tens of millions have suffered severe emotional distress as a direct result of the defendant THE UNITED STATES conduct and policies.
128. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

False imprisonment

129. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of American apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
130. The defendant THE UNITED STATES as a matter of policy has at all times since the establishment of the 14th Amendment historically sought to seek contrived

causes for which the pretext for the Constitutional requirement for involuntary servitude could be fulfilled.

131. The defendant THE UNITED STATES as a matter of policy has at all times since the establishment of the 14th Amendment continues to seek contrived causes for which the pretext for the Constitutional requirement for involuntary servitude could be fulfilled.
132. The defendant THE UNITED STATES as a matter of policy intends to confine the members of the Plaintiff class.
133. The defendant THE UNITED STATES as a matter of policy intends to confine many of the members of the Plaintiff class and those similarly situated by way of its subsidiaries, the corporate states, its municipalities and agencies.
134. The defendant THE NEW YORK STATE UNIFORM COURT SYSTEM and the defendant NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY SUPERVISION, acting jointly and severally, did intend to confine the individual Plaintiff doing business as "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" herein as he is a member of the Plaintiff class.
135. New York State Constitution Article 1, section 6 requires all prosecutors to obtain an indictment by way of a grand jury whenever the allegation of a crime being committed sought to be prosecuted constitutes a felony unless the party being accused has waived that obligation.
136. No such waiver existed in the instant circumstances involving the Plaintiff d.b.a "WITHOUT PREJUDICE".
137. Schenectady County Assistant District Attorney Amy Burock proceeded in to prosecute party herein doing business as "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" without ever acquiring an indictment from a grand jury.
138. Schenectady County Assistant District Attorney Amy Burock proceeded in to prosecute the aforementioned action (Indictment # b-207-1) with fraudulent grand jury minutes.
139. The defendant THE NEW YORK STATE UNIFORM COURT SYSTEM was put on notice of this details immediately upon discovering the truth of the entire matter.

Supervisory Courts found in the Appellate Division, THIRD AND FOURTH DEPARTMENTS each denied appropriate relief in connection to these details;

140. The Plaintiff herein d.b.a "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" was aware that he or she was being confined unlawfully / illegally.
141. The Plaintiff herein d.b.a "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" did not consent to the confinement.
142. The confinement of the Plaintiff herein d.b.a "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" was not otherwise privileged.
143. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

Fraud – Fraudulent Inducement

144. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of American apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
145. The defendant THE UNITED STATES acting in the capacity of government and charged with the authority bestowed by the govern, establish the existence of a special or privity-like relationship imposing a duty on the defendant to impart correct information to the plaintiff once it has presumed to no longer exclude this targeted population from the body politic explicitly;
146. The defendant THE UNITED STATES acting in the capacity of government and charged with the authority bestowed by the govern did present the Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated with the title "citizen" but that information was incorrect in that the status conferred upon those who embraced the 14th Amendment of the Constitution is subordinate to that of the people of the United States, the heretofore announced "citizens" within the jurisdiction of the United States.
147. The Plaintiffs and those similarly situated did reasonably rely upon the information found in the Constitution and its amendments on its face.

148. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Sixth cause of action.

149. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

150.

151. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Seventh Cause of Action

Indemnification

152. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
153. In wake of the fraudulent conduct exercised by the defendant THE UNITED STATES deliberating inducing Plaintiffs to act to their detriment, it is the defendant THE UNITED STATES that is actively at fault in bringing about the injury or damages at issue;
154. In dissolving the policy of overt forms of chattel slavery in the 13th Amendment of the Constitution, the Plaintiffs and those who are similarly situated are instantly indemnified for the losses & injuries sustained as a result of the wanton tortable acts exercised by the defendant THE UNITED STATES which include, but is not limited to fraud, intentional emotional distress, unjust enrichment and kidnapping. (see In re Sept. 11 Litig., 751 F.3d 86, 94 (2d Cir. 2014).
155. The obligations made incumbent upon 14th Amendment citizens, including but not limited to, the imposition of "income taxes" NOT otherwise constitutionally made applicable to the people of the United States are by the identification of the fraud indemnify the Plaintiffs from further exploitation of their labor for the continued unjust enrichment of others outside the Plaintiff class.
156. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Eighth cause for action

Invasion of Privacy – Improper Use Name, Picture or Likeness

157. ~~Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are~~ similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
158. The only cause of action for “Invasion of Privacy” in New York is the codification invasion of privacy in connection with the unauthorized use of a person’s name or face for commercial purposes. N.Y. Civ. Rights Law § 51 (Consol. 2013); see Messenger v. Gruner + Jahr Printing & Publishing, 94 N.Y.2d 436, 441 (2000) (“New York does not recognize a common-law right of privacy and Section 51 was enacted to “provide a limited statutory right of privacy”).
159. The defendant THE UNITED STATES uses a living Plaintiff’s name, picture or likeness for commercial, trade or advertising purposes with the establishment of a birth certificate;
160. The defendant THE UNITED STATES uses a living Plaintiff’s name, picture or likeness for commercial, trade or advertising purposes with the establishment of a birth certificate without the plaintiff’s written consent;
161. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Ninth cause for action

13th amendment violation

162. ~~Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are~~ similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
163. The defendant imputed its jurisdiction upon the plaintiff d.b.a WITHOUT PREJUDICE;
164. THE CONDITION OF INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE WAS NOT VOLUNTTEER VIA THE 14TH AMENDMENT OR OTHERWISE;
165. THE DEFENDANT THE UNITED STATES KNOWINGLY DEPRIVED THE PLAINTIFF OF HIS HUMAN RIGHTS;
- 166.** The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Tenth cause for action

Rescission

167. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
168. Justification for the rescission of the 14th Amendment's applicability to the Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated in light of the fraud exercised in the inducement of the contract;
169. Justification for the rescission of the 14th Amendment's applicability to the Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated is further buttressed by in light of the fraud exercised in the inducement of the contract by the absence of consideration. Plaintiffs were placed in a foreign land in the most extreme circumstances and lack all resources including but not limited to, literacy after centuries of involuntary servitude. At all times, this population still subject to the direction of their oppressors, are acting under duress.
170. an inability to perform the contract after it is made; or

171. Justification for the rescission of the 14th Amendment's applicability to the Plaintiffs herein and those similarly situated is further buttressed by a breach in the contract which substantially defeats the purpose thereof. That is, the 14th Amendment is sought to assert human rights hitherto deprived within the body politic, but careful legal analysis of one schooled in the arts of law reveal its composition is designed for the complete opposite purpose.

172. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Eleventh Cause for Action

Slander of Title

173. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

174. A communication falsely casting doubt on the validity of the plaintiff's title;

175. That was reasonably calculated to cause harm; and

176. The plaintiff suffered special damages as a result.

177. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Twelveth Cause for Action

Thirteenth Cause of Action

Subrogation, Equitable

178. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
- 179.
- 180.
181. Where property of one person is used in discharging an obligation owed by another or a lien upon the property of another,
182. Under such circumstances that the other would be unjustly enriched by the retention of the benefit thus conferred,
183. The former is entitled to be subrogated to the position of the obligee or lien-holder.
184. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Fourteenth Cause of Action

Unjust Enrichment

185. ~~Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are~~ similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
186. Proving an unjust enrichment claim under New York law requires a plaintiff to prove:
- a) **that the defendant benefitted;**
 - b) **at the plaintiff's expense; and**
 - c) **that equity and good conscience require restitution."**
- Beth Israel Med. Ctr. v. Horizon Blue Cross & Blue Shield, Inc., 448 F.3d 573, 586 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). "
187. THE DEFENDANT THE UNITED STATES BENEFITTED as it created an entire class of fictional states as member states of THE UNITED STATES that otherwise did NOT exist prior to the Civil War. For instance, there are at present TWO STATES of North Carolina, one in which "people" reside upon actual land, and a second wherein fictional "persons" reside. The duality of this construct to simply usurp our rights as human beings is kept hidden even from those who have never left the union of the united States established in 1776 and ratified the 1787 Constitution. New York ratified the 1787 Constitution on July 26, 1788 , a state that derived its authority from the people. What state assumed authority over the Plaintiff appearing herein d.b.a WITHOUT PREJUDICE is part of the deception because although appearing in court as a human being, WITHOUT PREJUDICE is one of those human beings that is a decendant of those held in bondage, and as such, in America has no rights under its Constitution AS A HUMAN BEING! The New York State Unified Court System prosecutes all such human beings as artificial entities, for which their human rights are presumed forfeited:
188. Because under the law, we technically are NOT considered human beings, we can't technically commit a crime. This policy implemented to deprive us of our human rights is admittedly by the defendants is NOT LAW, but operates under "the color of law"! It kinda resembles law, but is NOT law as human beings govern

- themselves. As designated "property" we are seized in courtrooms across the entire country in a fictional construct designed for that very purpose.
189. How does the defendant THE UNITED STATES usurp allegations of human rights abuses? Very cleverly. Deny you are dealing with human beings from the outset. In the United States, you have to carefully define what you mean when you describe human beings because on the face of the terminology, its Constitution does not subscribe to the tenets of Natural Law all other nations of the world share intuitively.
190. THE COLOR OF LAW robs us of our humanity from inception, and with that, the unalienable rights that come with it.
191. Furthermore, New York State seeks to bolster its policy of human rights deprivation by modifying the terminology used to described those involuntarily held in bondage under the color of law. The transition from prisoner to inmate is complete, but inmates still exercise whatever legal remedies are extended to them.
192. The proliferation of literacy among this targeted population has resulted in increasingly formidable legal challenges to the inhuman conditions and the causes for incarceration in the original instance.
193. To nullify this exercise of human rights to redress grievances against the government, New York State has begun to designate its former prisons as "correctional facilities" and those held prisoner therein are no longer simply designated inmates, but PATIENTS that require state authorities to approve their release from incarceration. This is in addition to denied access to the courts because of their new designated "incompetent" status as "patients".
194. It is via the abuse of words that provides the defendant THE UNITED STATES the forum to deny the crimes it systemically commits against humanity. It is by systemically depriving the rights otherwise due to human beings in the original instance that the defendant THE UNITED STATES has placed itself in the position it occupies in the world, but at all times hiding the truth about its history and commitment to human right abuses from its very inception.
195. The defendant THE UNITED STATES benefitted from its abuse and fraudulent acts exercised against the Plaintiffs;

196. The acts committed by the defendant THE UNITED STATES was done at the Plaintiff's expense;
197. Equity and good conscience require restitution from the defendant THE UNITED STATES for its deliberate acts that target the Plaintiffs, the basis of which has been announced as beyond the boundaries of slavery, **but is rooted in race**.
198. Defendants have improperly benefited from the crimes against humanity, systematic murders, massacres, killings, imprisonments, torture, forced removals, banishments, enslavement and theft of assets, and otherwise immoral, illegal and inhumane acts committed under the apartheid system in South Africa from 1948 to 1993.
199. Defendants have failed to account for and or return to plaintiffs and the Plaintiffs' class, the profits and/or benefits the defendants derived there from and defendants have concealed the nature and scope of their conspiracy, participation and/or other dealings to fund, aid and abet, and/or otherwise support apartheid from 1948 to 1993.
200. As a result of the defendants' wrongful acts and omissions as described above, defendants have been unjustly enriched.
201. Defendants have been unjustly enriched at the expense of plaintiffs and the plaintiffs' class. Plaintiffs, and the plaintiffs' class therefore demand restitution and judgment against the defendants jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court and to be determined at the trial herein, together with interest, exemplary or punitive damages, attorney's fees and the costs of this action.
202. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Fifteenth Cause of Action

CIVIL CONSPIRACY

193. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
194. The defendant THE UNITED STATES has by way of an agreement with other corporate government entitles which includes, but is not limited to, the defendant NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM and the defendant NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY SUPERVISION to effectuate the deprivation of rights endowed by the Creator, but instead, treat such human beings as subordinate;
195. The defendant THE UNITED STATES acting jointly and severally did commit several acts in the furtherance of the agreement which includes, but is NOT limited to, a joint raid of state and federal agents on the Monestary located at 428 Duane Avenue to confiscate all evidence of the illegal exercise of its jurisdiction over the Plaintiff doing business as "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" herein on the 12th day of December 2012.
196. Additional collaboration between state and federal authorities is found with the used of a contrived social security number (108-58-7454) to impute 14th Amendment status upon the Plaintiff where that status was NOT, upon information and belief, otherwise applicable.
197. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.
198. The collaborative efforts of the state and federal defendants described herein intentional participation in the furtherance of a plan or purpose to illegally impose its jurisdiction over the Plaintiff where they knowingly had none has resulted damages and injury compensation for which is more fully setforth below.

Sixteenth Cause of Action

*** FRAUD MISREPRESENTATION ***

199. ~~Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are~~ similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.
200. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did knowingly used the title "citizen" in the 14th Amendment of the United States;
201. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did know the title "citizen" in the 14th Amendment of the United States did NOT confer upon those who rely upon the 14th Amendment the substantive rights of citizens otherwise found mentioned in its Constitution.
202. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did know the title "citizen" in the 14th Amendment of the United States was a misrepresentation or otherwise presents a material omission of fact about the true nature of the status it is presumed to confer upon any potential adherent thereof;
203. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did know the title "citizen" in the 14th Amendment of the United States was false and known to be false at the time it composed the 14th Amendment;
204. The defendant THE UNITED STATES did know the title "citizen" in the 14th Amendment of the United States was made for the purpose of inducing members of the Plaintiff class to rely upon it;
205. The Plaintiffs are justifiably relied upon the misrepresentation or material omission of the meaning of "citizen" within the Constitution as it hitherto had only one meaning within the context of its framework;
206. The Plaintiffs have suffered injury and damages for decades as a result thereof;
207. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Seventeenth Cause of Action

FRAUD CONCEALMENT

203. ~~Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are~~ similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

204.

Legal Definition of fraudulent concealment:

the intentional failure to disclose a material fact and especially the existence of a cause of action by one under a duty to make such a disclosure to another who acts or fails to act in reliance and suffers a loss

205. Evidence other fraudulent concealment is self-evident in the 16th Amendment to the Constitution, wherein the plain reading leaves a reader with the impression income tax applies to all, both people and persons alike, when the United States Supreme Court decisions on the matter are conclusive.
206. What is concealed in this instance is the truth about who income taxes actually apply to and the nature of the status conferred upon many Americans today to their detriment UNKNOWINGLY!
207. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Eighteenth Cause of Action

Federal Tort Claims Act

208. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

209. The status of those in the Plaintiff class who have NOT volunteered for the 14th Amendment slavery is NOT entirely made self evident from the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States.

210.

211. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Nineteenth Cause of Action

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

212. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

213. the defendant THE UNITED STATES CONTINUES TO COMMIT SUCH ACTS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF;

214. that torture by way of electromagnetic radiation is added to the means of oppression;

215. that mental health of these human beings is deliberately placed under attack;

216. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Twentieth Cause of Action

Cause of Action to Recover Civil Damages

Pursuant to the Law of Nations and/or Customary International Law

217. Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other victims of apartheid who are similarly situated, re-allege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation contained into the preceding paragraphs.

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

218. Not able to do except by denying the unalienable rights bestowed upon us by our Creator in our very creation as human beings. The attack upon this targeted population has always been in denying rights AS HUMAN BEINGS that is naturally due to us. The suggestion that we volunteered to be slaves under any circumstances is so foolish, that central premise is hidden behind an avalanche of content in the tax code. That same foolish premise of volunteer slavery is attached to a mother's joy to simply put the world on notice of the human being she has been given the responsibility from heaven to cultivate into a productive member of society. The legislature and those charged with the duty to execute the law have by these policies divided society into two classes, people and persons, free and slave, or simply informed and uninformed.

219. Those in the know, those who are kept abreast of this unscrupulous schemes form there own society within society, a subset of the greater society who are privy to certain information that makes a different set of rules applicable to them, a secret society, all unto themselves.

However, the defendant THE UNITED STATES, is a party to several treaties that affirm the EQUALITY OF HUMANITY. The treaties THE UNITED STATES are parties to do NOT have a history of denying America's targeted population of their rights as human beings, nor is the sovereignty of THE UNITED STATES sufficient to bar jurisdiction from the intervention of foreign nations to prosecute America's four-hundred-year policy of continuous crimes against humanity, a record that is unprecedented in the history of human civilization.

220. The Plaintiffs invoice for the injuries sustained, the retribution deserved and the reparations that are long overdue are detailed in the concluding portions involving damages below.

Outstanding debts, Overdue Compensation

221. The Jews of Germany know all too well **national interest** and **community interest** can swim in different directions. What happens to a people who cannot look to the national government to promote their safety and advantage even while you have pledged and demonstrated your allegiance? For the Jews of Europe, the solution was the creation of land of their very own. .

attempting to function as a nation ***within a nation*** as a means for survival against hostile U.S. race-based practices (see COINTELPRO; see also WAR ON DRUGS).

222. The History of THE UNITED STATES acting in bad faith with **non-European** people in the Americas is well documented in the hundreds of treaties it has broken in connection with the people who were originally domiciled upon the land and who are known to us generally as “**Native Americans**”. THE UNITED STATES has NOT acted in GOOD FAITH in their dealings with that non-European people exercising their GOD-GIVEN sovereign authority and capacity, neither has THE UNITED STATES fulfilled its commitments made to this non-European nation once the military assistance necessary to keep the nation from fracturing was received and the pillars of forcible chattel slavery (**SLAVERY 1.0 ~ TRANSATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE**) were dismantled. Just as described by President Abraham Lincoln before his assassination by members of his own nation, the governing authorities of THE UNITED STATES have had absolutely no intention of equitably integrating people of African ancestry into its political fold. In removing President Lincoln involuntarily from office by way a bullet to the back of his head, those hostile government actors, including the subsequent President (*Andrew Johnson*) unilaterally and unlawfully dismissed the obligations upon the Executive office made by the War time President & Commander-in-Chief as found in *Special Order#15*.

223. Abraham Lincoln, Commander-in Chief was also by trade an attorney at law. The significance of the distinctions between the terminology he himself used in describing white “people” in contrast to black “persons” only magnifies the extreme ingrained prejudice those part of the nation’s body politic have against those brought to this new

Egypt by way of ships. There is a hatred, an unprovoked enmity of biblical proportions against this targeted population that hasn't escaped any government office, any government branch, any government agency. The United States Supreme Court is clear. The meaning of the Constitution's use of citizen applies to people, as in white people, and not black "persons", those regarded as property:

No one, we presume, supposes that any change in public opinion or feeling, in relation to this unfortunate race, in the civilized nations of Europe or in this country, should induce the court to give to the words of the Constitution a more liberal construction in their favor than they were intended to bear when the instrument was framed and adopted. Such an argument would be altogether inadmissible in any tribunal called on to interpret it. If any of its provisions are deemed unjust, there is a mode prescribed in the instrument itself by which it may be amended; but while it remains unaltered, it must be construed now as it was understood at the time of its adoption. It is not only the same in words, but the same in meaning, and delegates the same powers to the Government, and reserves and secures the same rights and privileges to the citizen; and as long as it continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only in the same words, but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of this court, and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day. This court was not created by the Constitution for such purposes. Higher and graver trusts have been confided to it, and it must not falter in the path of duty.

What the construction was at that time, we think can hardly admit of doubt. We have the language of the Declaration of Independence and of the Articles of Confederation, in addition to the plain words of the Constitution itself; we have the legislation of the different States, before, about the time, and since, the Constitution was adopted; we have the legislation of Congress, from the time of its adoption to a recent period; and we have the constant and uniform action of the Executive Department, all concurring together, and leading to the same result. **And if anything in relation to the construction of the Constitution can be regarded as settled, it is that which we now give to the word 'citizen' and the word 'people.'**

And upon a full and careful consideration of the subject, the court is of opinion, that, upon the facts stated in the plea in abatement, **Dred Scott was not a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and not entitled as such to sue in its courts;** and, consequently, that the Circuit Court had no jurisdiction of the case, and that the judgment on the plea in abatement is erroneous.

224. Early in U.S. history, the Europeans founders of America acknowledged “...**all men are created equal**” as a self evident truth in their Declaration of Independence, yet in framing the national constitution, many of these same declarants codified in those very documents an assessment of the Africans held in bondage among them as worthy to be counted as only three-fifths of that their European counterparts (*see U.S. Const. Article 1 Section 2*). The legacy of human inequality is thus cemented in the U.S. Constitution and upheld as a national policy by the nation’s highest court (*see Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1857)). This historic court determination outlines in great detail America’s **Anti-African** human rights abuse policy past, present and future. The reality of this judicially enforced caste system has not waived in principle since then.

225. Reconstruction in the post Civil War Era involved installing the legislative pillars by which the newest manifestation of social inequality (**SLAVERY 2.0~TRANS ENS LEGIS SLAVE TRADE**) could be implemented. All efforts to integrate the people of African ancestry into the body politic by these hostile European government authorities were necessarily illusory by clever design.

226. Reconstructing the colonial economic engine found in slavery without the exposure to the criticism, hostility and the rebellion forcible chattel slavery triggers involves providing a pretext by which the desired economic activity could be justified under the cloud of government authority, or as it is described legislatively “under the color of law”. That carefully worded superficial pretext is found in the 13th Amendment (*see EXHIBIT G*) which presumably ends chattel slavery in America. This simply is NOT so. A careful reading thereof reveals slavery in the United States is no longer applied to anyone unconditionally. One of the conditions that authorizing the imposition of slave status is the as punishment for a crime. This first of two constitutional loopholes from which slavery is endorsed provides the framework by which every government’s institutions are constructed to facilitate the transition of people with African Heritage from personal liberty

to prison lockdown. There is an entire branch of American history devoted to the study of this concerted effort by government actors from Reconstruction & the imposition of Jim Crow Laws (*Jim Crow Era, Black Codes, PIGS laws, Vagrancy statutes, convict leasing policies, Slave Codes, etc...*) through modern day Rockefeller Laws and Post Release Supervision.

- *Private Prisons in America: A Critical Race Perspective* By Michael A. Hallett – 2006
- *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* By Michelle Alexander
- *The Black and the Blue: A Cop Reveals the Crimes, Racism, and Injustice in America's Law Enforcement* By Matthew Horace
- *Race and Justice: Wrongful Convictions of African American Men* By Marvin D. Free, Jr., Mitch Ruesink -

227. The grounds upon which one is arrested doesn't matter. Even loitering suffices. If your Black in America, you need not commit a crime to go to prison, the system will INVENT a charge. Each government actor in this 13th Amendment backdoor slave pipeline contributes to this corrupt system so much so that the United States which houses less than five percent (5%) of the world's population has about 25% of its prisoners.
228. SLAVERY is still big business in America. Prisons are indistinguishable from fortified plantations and where prisons are both PRIVATE and PROFITABLE, the demand for an increasing prison inmate population requires the arms of Criminal Justice system and legislatures to do their utmost to meet those quotas. The unconscionable manner in which police officers have resorted to acquire people have recently been met with outrage given the conclusive power a portable camera has in recording such events. However, no such evidentiary luxury exist in the courtrooms in America wherein the only evidence of the events that happen in court are those that survive the presiding judge's unilateral, unbridled redaction capacity. Neither are these cell phone cameras allowed in the prisons where correctional officers have the privacy to abuse where street cops do not. In both the courts and the prisons, members of the criminal justice system in America act with much more than immunity. They act with impunity. The events surrounding our beloved brother George Floyd is irrefutable evidence we are suffocating. His death is no isolated incident. I know from personal experience, it is business as usual in America. (SLAVERY 3.0 ~ TRANSHUMANISM SLAVE TRADE).

229. Human Rights Abuse in America against African-Americans in particular has in large measure never been identified as such because of the covert efforts made by the federal government to :

- a) suppress the details of its occurrences; and
- b) to spin the details of the incidents of human rights abuses by classifying the matter as something other than what it is.

The truth of this phenomena can be readily demonstrated in the national policy police officers have when they encounter men who are perceived to be “African-American” (also referred to as Black).

230. As a unwritten rule, police officers approach this demographic in particular with hostile intentions, more often than not weapons are drawn, and with increasing frequency the human being of obvious African heritage is left assaulted, battered, bruised, or worse – murdered by those very police officers who are oft times merely looking for probable cause for approach in the original instance. IN AMERICA BEING BLACK IS PROBABLE CAUSE FOR APPROACH BY POLICE OFFICERS. The documented, universal Black experience “driving while Black” speaks for itself.

But this complaint speaks to all dimensions of the Black experience in America. Even as a pedestrian, being Black can result in death without provocation or any other cause whenever racist White Americans choose to act upon their racist sentiment (*see Trayvon Martin*). A stroll to a local gas station during the half time while watching a sports program at home resulting in this Black teenage student being chased down tackled and shot by a White man with no authority to act as a police officer. The resulting dismissal of any allegations of wrong doing did more than just spur on further attacks against African-Americans, but also insult has been added to injury when the White attacker thereafter sues the family of the victim. This incident is not isolated, but to the contrary has become so prevalent that a social movement, BLACK LIVES MATTER, has grown in response. Trayvon Martin is but one name on a long list of victims by racist White Americans both clothe with and without government authority. Either way, the result is still the same – nullification of the consequences. Those who target African-Americans with human rights abuses on behalf of the state are sought to be federalized, and thus any such acts and excessive use of force is justified by the authority vested in THE UNITED STATES. What

has been the response of United States government officials thus far who get reports about these race-based incidents and observe the videos thereof in the national broadcast about local, state and/or federal agents and police officers operating with impunity *disproportionately* against African-Americans in particular? What has been the response of the United States federal authorities and legislatures to those who cry out in civil unrest and protest for justice?

231. Criminalized those who complain.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (*hereinafter F.B.I.*) has contrived a new designation for members of the African-American community who seek to become community activists and respond to the threat that this abusive police presence is having upon families in the community. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE any efforts by African-Americans/Black People to remedy problems in their own community by way of organizing fellow African-Americans is subject to undefined, unqualified federal scrutiny with the new federal classification “**BLACK IDENTITY EXTREMIST**” for which immediate seizure and incarceration is NOW LEGAL (*even without cause*). If you are Black/African-American and desire to act in the best interest of those members of the community with whom there is a shared heritage, as it stands currently, the United States government has vested its resources and is exercising its authority against you in whatever ways it deems necessary to perpetually destabilize you circumstances and deprive you of the capacity to properly seek redress of grievances against the government collectively (meaning as a community). This newest federal policy that targets African-Americans in particular is part of the legacy of oppressive legislation and government policies that includes but is not limited to THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES itself!

Efforts to redress grievances against government actors, agents employees, public officers and/or servants for HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES in particular are nullified in THE UNITED STATES against African-Americans by way of the legislative vehicle that has been extended for this population in particular to be endowed with the rights all other Americans, **the people**, are acknowledged to have as a gift from THE CREATOR. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States does NOT acknowledge African-Americans as one of the people, but in fact designate members of this population as **persons** thereby circumventing all infractions against human rights with the stroke of a

pen. There are NO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES where AFRICAN-AMERICANS HAVE NEVER BEEN CONSTITUTIONALLY ACKNOWLEDGED AS HUMAN BEINGS!

232. We human beings of African heritage who were formerly held in bondage have always sought to exert our rights AS HUMAN BEINGS, and exist AS HUMAN BEINGS in accordance with Natural Law. However, in the United States there has been a deliberate, concerted effort to create an entire new social class in the post chattel slavery era, a second tier political level of existence wherein African-Americans can be extended the “privileges and immunities” the People (*which in America has historically means White people by implication*) enjoy as matter of “**right**” bestowed by THE CREATOR. The distinction made between African-Americans not existing as “people” under the law, but instead “**persons**” is evinced even in the writings of the so-called Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, himself an attorney who readily understood the distinctions he was making in the descriptions he used to separate the newly freed human beings of African Heritage from the European Americans who held them captive as slaves:

This schism between “**the people**” and “**the persons**” documented in the founding document of THE UNITED STATES has historically manifested itself in every facet of American society (*see*

➤ *A **Medical Apartheid**: The Dark History of Medical Experimentation on Black Americans from Colonial Times to the Present* By Harriet A. Washington

merica has been founded upon racial injustice and has profited financially on a scale that is inconceivable. African-Americans have served as the capital and labor force, the euphemistic “**human resource**” all the while never politically formally acknowledge to be human and extended the rights all other human beings in general, and White people in particular, have been able to exercise in the same environment since day one. **WHY IS THIS REMEDY NECESSARY?**

233. Because the conditions for chattel slavery have never gone away, but merely re-marketed and the manner in which slavery was implemented in the original instance has been upgraded so that the entire inhuman system can be sustained and legitimized under the color of government authority.

The plantations have again become private BUT are fortified with 50 foot walls and sharp shooters willing to kill any African-American held in bondage under the pretext that human being is a criminal. The problem is that presumes A JUST CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

234. Where the government itself operates in secret, and uses the courtroom as a platform by which African-Americans are again put into their bondage status, the inhuman institution is tolerated because of the pretext placed upon the bondage no matter how illegitimate that pretext may be. When prisons have been privatized, are profitable and require an increasing stream of inmates to supply the cheap labor (*as little as 10 cents per hour in New York State*), this income stream can only be fed by the Criminal Justice System with each branch thereof executing their part in that conspiracy respectively. Police Officers serve as "recruiters"; Prosecutors function as "processors" and Judges "validators" supervising and certifying the entire dehumanization process.

Human Rights Abuses in America (INDIVIDUAL ABUSE)

ASPHYXIATION

Not since NAZI GERMANY have human beings who have committed no crime been rounded up and processed by government actors, agents, employees, public officers and/or servants under the pretext that WHO THEY ARE is the source of the cause for the government's targeting. Such is the case of this complainant who on the 27th day of January, 2014, on the campus of the State University of New York at Albany registering for classes in the Mathematics PhD program at my alma mater was arrested and taken by a campus police officer without any incident to spur that arrest! *PLEASE TAKE NOTICE of the tens of millions of African-Americans and the hundreds of Universities, less than twenty graduate annually with a doctorate in Mathematics in the United States.* Upon what cause has this former middle school and high school Mathematics teacher held for more than a year in government custody. Whatever the cause, the complainant was told the maximum release date was the following year (MAY 2015). Upon what cause did the same government keep this human being of African heritage in custody until October 9th, 2015, MORE THAT FIVE (5) BEYOND THEIR OWN EXPRESSED MAXIMUM RELEASE DATE?! No government agent, actor, employee, municipality, public officer and/or servant has answered that question,

nor have they been made to answer when those charged with the authority to compel government parties (namely judicial authorities) have allowed the complaints submitted to be served upon any culpable parties.

235. That is, the judicial system itself is part of the problem in systemically denying African-Americans human rights.

This immunity does not apply to intentional injuries, fraud, or bad faith.

Where African-Americans have been presumably set free by the 13th Amendment of the Constitution, the status of slave is NOT removed when this same group is only permitted to become members of the body politic by way of an agent created by way of the pen, a legal avatar, a functional body suit which is itself owned and is the property of a corporation. African-Americans are NOT allowed to live as human beings counted among the people under the law within this body politic like their former European slave labor torturers, but to the contrary are only permitted to be active participants of the economy built for the people (which by inference are white) ONLY upon the condition that as BLACK PEOPLE we instead voluntarily choose to adopt the legal designation of "person" and in doing so acknowledge that we have no rights that are NOT self-evidently bestowed by The Creator, that we are equal, but instead are only extended the privileges and immunities extended by hitherto held in bondage by brute force. The 14th Amendment is a pledge by the federal government to extend to African-Americans the opportunity to become slaves voluntarily no matter what so called "privileges" and "immunities" there are presumed to be Superficially, African-Americans are thereby bestowed the title "US CITIZENS", but substantively our legal status has never changed. Human beings that are owned are human beings that are owned. Slavery using another premise only magnifies the cause for relief.

This dehumanizing economic engine has driven an assortment of European colonies from abject state poverty to the leading world economy. The estimated capitalization value of the labor performed by Black slaves in America between 1619 and 1865 , compounded at 6% interest through 1993 is \$97,100,000,000,000 (Source: This number came from Harper's Magazine and is based on figures found in Clarence J. Munford, Race and Reparations: A Black Perspective for the 21st Century (Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 1996),

428-429). It is not just the particular amount that is alarming, but the sheer scale of the that amount of wealth being generated is more than enough incentive for capitalist who operate without a conscience to continue the practice in perpetuity. The savage nature of its implementation in the original instance across the Americas was in the course of time met with ever increasing political opposition. The volume of that resistance was bad for business, hence the modifications.

236. SLAVERY MUST NOT BE VISIBLE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

Slave labor in America is kept hidden behind the fortified walls of prisons. This strategic barrier soothes public objection because of the pretext for which those who are held in bondage are maintained as such. There is no need to raise objections by exploiting Black people when if we market the same people criminals those objections would cease. The financial incentive to continue America's age old cash cow exploitive practices is enhanced as the prisons themselves are PRIVATELY OWNED and stock holders demand the return of profits. Fortune five hundred companies readily exploit the services of this popular for pennies on the dollar what they other pay the same parties if they were not so reduced in their legal status. For this cause, the American prison population is unparalleled in the world with only 5% percent of the world's population but 25% of its prison population...and rising. No one notices except the families of those whose sons, brothers, fathers and husbands among others have missing for years on end. For those of us who have emerged from the heritage of chattel slavery, the scars of missing family are still visible. The lash of American slavery still remains. There is no need to build slave ships anymore when you have courtrooms with admiralty jurisdiction.

THE TRANS-LEGIS SLAVE TRADE .

SLAVERY VIA PRISON REQUIRES A STEADY STREAM OF NEW SLAVES. The law of DEMAND in America means THE LAW HAS TO SUPPLY. The hidden economic engine has a complementary political mechanic to maintain its function properly. The legislative loophole to enact this subversive is engraved in the Constitutional Amendment itself: "“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”".

To meet the demands of the ever increasing, very profitable privatized prison system, prosecutors must be ready to execute their duties on demand, judges must make their courtrooms conviction friendly and the law enacted by legislatures must be constructed with this target population in mind. The contrived “War on drugs” where the government imports the drugs into these poverty stricken communities and distributes the product by way of its own agents and their contacts has created a tsunami of available African-American men primed and ready for slavery 2.0 processing... or are they?

There is a legal conundrum whenever these African-American appear in court. Who is being prosecuted? Is it the human being that appears before the court OR is it the legal avatar, the “person” that appears only on paper? This is the legal dilemma those who have pledged to never acknowledge the humanity of the African people held in bondage, or the any descendants, whether slave or free in perpetuity :

“Dred Scott case quote”

This policy of not acknowledging the humanity of African people in America who were held in bondage, or any of their descendants, is further evinced even in the writings of the so called “Great Emancipator” -

Even while in the White House’s Oval Office, Abraham Lincoln the attorney refused to acknowledge the humanity of the very people who assistance he sought to keep the country united(see). If Abraham Lincoln refused to publically acknowledge that all men [and women] are created equal, then what of his opponents who have been and remain hostile to the general interest and well being of Black people? American society is fundamentally divided. What has accumulated from between 1865 and now is evidence to prove that white society’s hostile efforts and financial interest have never change against Black people, its simply has been made a secret. Two different body politics and one is strictly parasitic in its dealings. This strikes a fundamental contradiction in the definition of a nation, further magnifying the cause for relief:

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) request(s) that this Court grant the following relief:

The outstanding debt incurred with the agreement made for military assistance during the American Civil War resulting in the Special Order #15. That is there is land debt owed to the Plaintiffs;

The outstanding debt for the wanton practice of CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY FOR AT LEAST FOUR CENTURIES AND COUNTING;

A recognition of that land as sovereign, operating outside of the Constitution of the United States, and is not subject to any of its laws except as otherwise agreed by way of a treaty (not unprecedented as the United States has Indian "nations" within its borders;

An acknowledgment of our existence as a NATION unto ourselves, the kingdom of Priests, before the United Nations, and embrace the full breadth and depth of our GOD GIVEN rights human beings and be granted a seat along side THE UNITED STATES among the family of nations as an equal;

Annual compensation in the amount of 2.5% of the U.S Gross Domestic Product in perpetuity;

That the land negotiated NOT be landlocked. Access to the seas and to the family of nations shall never henceforth be deprived again;

A formal apology etched in stone for all the atrocities committed in the furtherance of, inter alia, unjust enrichment and racial hatred to be placed in every state capital and in the nation's capital;

Plaintiff and the plaintiff class demands a jury trial, judgment, and damages against the defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, if necessary:

- (1) For an order certifying the Plaintiffs' class alleged herein;
- (2) For an accounting
- (3) For the appointment of an independent historic commission;
- (4) For the imposition of a constructive trust;
- (5) For restitution of the value of their unjust enrichment
- (6) For disgorgement of illicit profits;
- (7) For compensatory damages in an amount to be determined by trial together with interest;
- (8) For exemplary or punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial
- (9) For attorneys' fees and costs; and
- (10) For such further relief as this Court may be deem just and equitable.

PLAINTIFFS,

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: 29TH day of September 2022

Signature of Plaintiff(s)

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Without Prejudice

FROM


William Praileau
29 Jay Street
Post Office Box 1367
Schenectady, New York

TO

United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York

SM 5P
NY

Water
10 1/2" x 16"

Ready  Post